

REMARKS

This Amendment, submitted in reply to the Office Action dated June 6, 2005, is believed to be fully responsive to each point of rejection raised therein. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration on the merits is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-21 remain pending in the application. Claims 5 and 17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 1, 6-13, 18-19 and 20-21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Shidara and Akabori. Claims 2 and 14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Shidara and Akabori and further in view of Walkingshaw. Claims 4 and 16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Shidara, Akabori and Walkingshaw and further in view of Yamamoto. Claim 5 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Shidara and Akabori and Walkingshaw and further in view of Honma. Applicant submits the following response in traversal of the prior art and Section 112 rejections.

Proposed amendments for responding to the Section 112 rejections are set forth above. Applicant submits that the amendments should be entered because they do not raise issues in need of further consideration. To expedite prosecution of this case, Applicant cancels claims 1, 7, 9-13 and 19-20. Applicant further rewrites claims 2, 5-6, 8, 14 and 21 in independent form. Applicant submits that these modifications should be entered since the merely rewrite dependent subject matter into independent claim form.

With the above amendments, Applicant submits the following arguments in traversal of the prior art rejections.

Applicant's invention relates to a printing apparatus that is able to print information from broadcast signals based on a priority associated with the broadcast contents. In an exemplary embodiment, the broadcast data includes category information about the contents of the images in addition to the images. The categories can further be prioritized for purposes of determining printing.

Turning to the cited art, Shidara relates generally to printing labels for associated broadcast programs.

Akabori relates to printer management when several computer terminals are serviced by one printer. The print manager determines priority of printing requests and also assesses the resources available to determine whether a print job should be reordered based on priority and/or resource availability.

Honma relates to conversion of an image to different resolutions, such as according to a number of times a request for a particular image is made. This reduces the amount of storage necessary to store image data.

Claim 2 describes that a judging unit instructs printing data contents when a print designation code for designating a category of contents coincides with a code carried on the broadcast signal. The Examiner concedes that the combination of Shidara and Akabori fails to teach this feature but cites Walkingshaw to make up for this deficiency. The Examiner contends that Walkingshaw would be combinable with the primary combination to print only materials desired by the user. Applicant submits that this does not appear to be consistent with the objects of the combined reference Akabori. Akabori was cited for purposes of assignment of priority for

each print job. If the user has requested a print job, then it is clear that the user wants the object printed. Thus, the Examiner's rationale that Walkingshaw would allow omission of certain printing completely undermines the objects of Akabori. Therefore, the Examiner's rationale is inconsistent and not supportable based on the teachings of the references. Therefore, claim 2 is patentable. Claim 14 is patentable for analogous, though not necessarily coextensive recitations as set forth for claim 2. Claims 3-4 and 15-17 are patentable based on their dependency.

With regard to claim 5, this claim describes printing contents of information associated with a category code depending on a frequency of a category code. The Examiner concedes that the combination of Shidara, Akabori and Walkingshaw fails to teach this feature but cites Honma (col. 9, lines 38-63) to correct this deficiency. Applicant submits that Honma relates to how an image becomes stored based on a number of print requests. This does not correspond to printing based the number of occurrences of a category code. The relationship of Honma (a form of process based on print requests) appears to be the opposite of the claim (printing based on a category code frequency). Therefore, claim 5 is patentable. Claim 17 which describes analogous, though not necessarily coextensive features, is also patentable for the reasons set forth for claim 5.

With regard to claim 6, this claim describes printing of designated contents and information relating thereto. The Examiner relies on paragraphs 19, 34 and 52 of Shidara as teaching this aspect. The last two paragraphs only relate to printing of a label, which must correspond to the recited contents for the Examiner to maintain any rejection of the base claim

requirements.¹ However, there is no further printing of information corresponding to the label in any of the cited portions of Shidara. Paragraph 19 describes how printing of the label becomes actuated. Claim 6 is patentable for at least these reasons. Claim 18 recites analogous, though not necessarily coextensive features, and is patentable for similar reasons set forth for claim 6.

Claim 8, describing combination of information and contents and printing thereof, is patentable for similar reasons.

With regard to claim 21, this claim describes plural categories characterized into character or image information. The Examiner cites paragraph 59 of Shidara to teach this feature. However, the cited portion relates to display of label information in various forms. Therefore, claim 21 is patentable for at least this reason.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

¹ The label is arguably broadcast and printed, but no indication of printing for other broadcast information is cited.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.116
EXPEDITED PROCEDURE
GROUP ART UNIT 2622

DOCKET NO. Q61694
U.S. Appln. No. 09/709,513

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Susan Perng Pan
Registration No. 41,239

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: August 17, 2005